DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 906 IR 013 291

AUTHOR Hand, James D.
TITLE Student Development: The Next Logical Focus.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 8p.; In: Instructional Development: The State of the Art, II; see IR 013 273. For volume I, see ED 292 444.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Counseling; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; Organizational Development; *Student College Relationship; *Student Development; *Student Educational Objectives; *Student Motivation

ABSTRACT

This chapter describes a new type of educational development, called student development; considers how student development relates to faculty, instructional, and organizational development; and describes innovative student development programs at several universities. As used in this discussion, the term student development involves a process by which the learner is educated to become a sophisticated consumer of education, with the process facilitating both educational and personal growth. This description differs significantly from the use of the term to describe programs evolving from offices of the dean of students, counseling centers, or learner skills centers, student improvement laboratories, and education units. The development of programs at the University of Vermont, the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, and the University of Arkansas Medical Sciences Campus that incorporate the ideas discussed in this chapter are described. It is argued that student development of the type described in this chapter is an integral part of the educational development process and must take it place alongside instructional, faculty, and organizational development. (7 references) (EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298906

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Chapter 18

Student Development: The Next Logical Focus

James D. Hand

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles Dills

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A new branch of educational development has recently appeared, to supplement F.D., O.D., and I.D.; it is student development (S.D.). Student development can be considered to be the development of, or work with, the student, much as F.D. is the development of, or work with, the faculty member. What is the nature of this concept, how is it implemented, and how does it relate to the other three functions? The present paper defines and describes this new area, giving both a theoretical discussion of S.D. and describing its implementation in several settings.

Instructional development, as it emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s, focused upon faculty and their teaching methods, administrative budgetary considerations impacting upon instruction, and to a very minute degree upon the types of students served. Information regarding students was limited to a few main categories: prerequisite learning, attitudes toward instruction, learning styles, and socioeconomic background. Armed with this information most schools could do little because of their limited instructional resources and the limited scope of teaching methods available to most teachers.

Researchers attempted to identify traits and aptitudes of groups of students so that instructional strategies and methods could be employed cost effectively in small-group and large-group instruction. As Cronbach (1975) pointed out, these studies have not proven particularly fruitful. In no research have educators found the panacea, the one true light by which all students may learn.

This chapter presents one plan for progress while we await an educational messiah. Instructional developers have busied themselves in faculty and organizational development in recent years. Now it is time for student development to take its place along side I.D., F.D., and O.D.

The purposes of this chapter are to:

1. Describe what student development is;
2. Discuss why S.D. is needed;
3. Indicate some of the interelationships and complementary aspect of S.D. to I.D., F.D., and O.D.;
4. Describe how student development can be carried out; and
5. Where it is being instituted.

WHAT IS STUDENT DEVELOPMENT?

For the purposes of this discussion, student development is considered to be the process by which the learner is educated to become a sophisticated consumer of education. The process facilitates both educational and personal growth. To this end, student development aims at increasing skills and establishing positive attitudes in the following areas:

- Evaluating both formal and informal instruction;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IR013291

- Setting educational and life goals and objectives;
- Educational and life-oriented research and data gathering;
- Fundamentals of budgeting and policy making (personal and institutional);
- Self-education and motivation toward lifelong learning;
- Development of the student's learning capabilities (both skills and attitudes) to their maximum potential.

This description differs significantly from those evolving within the context of 1) offices of deans of students, 2) counseling centers, 3) learning skills centers, student imporvement laboratories, and educational units. The first of these working definitions, which is used by many offices of deans of students is most readily found in the "Bulletin Board" section of The Chronicle of Higher Education. The job description for student development personnel include:

- "coordination of student judicial and disciplinary systems;"
- "counseling and advising students in groups;"
- "...must have Master's degree in student personnel, counseling or related field; a Ph.D. preferred";
- "...must also possess five years of relevant experience in residence halls and/or student services." (Chronicle of Higher Education, July 23, 1980).

The description used at counseling centers, at such schools as Cornell University and Kansas State University, encompasses student course selection, career choice and personal problem-solving activities. One job advertisement included the following:

- "...be responsible for working with students and faculty individually and in small groups in an attempt to counter and design behavior to improve effective learning and teaching."
- "...be responsible for the development and maintaining of records pertaining to study skills, and career preparation programs as well as academic, personal, and social counseling and peer tutoring." (Chronicle of Higher Education, July 14, 1980.)

Learning skills centers, student improvement laboratories, and educational development units see student development as a combination of areas including:

- increasing reading rate and comprehension;
- math skills;
- study skills;
- listening skills;
- visual skills;
- tutorial assistance.

A multitude of secondary schools and institutions of higher learning use this description.

A few institutions have gone beyond these limited descriptions in an attempt to develop the total person. Notable among these are The University of Arkansas-Fayetteville, and The University of Vermont. These two schools favor a working definition of student development similar to that used in this chapter.

WHY IS STUDENT DEVELOPMENT NEEDED?

What happens when we change the faculty, the instruction, and the environment yet do nothing to change the studnet's capability to cope with learning? We have spent much time and effort to make instruction fit the student, with mixed results. On the other hand we have spent precious little of our resources in educating the student to cope with whatever form of instruction is presented. Channeling the learner only down the path by which he learns most readily keeps the student from expanding his repertoire of capabilities just as surely as presenting instruction in the format most preferred by the instructor.

The prevailing philosophy among instructional development professionals holds that the primary beneficiary of our efforts should be the students. That is the reason we became involved in faculty development and, later, organizational development. To impact the entire educational system we must impact all pertinent components of the system including the student. The student is an integral part of the educational process, for without learners we cannot have education.

Philosophically, instructional developers have advocated the inclusion of students in the decision-making processes involving curriculum development, goals and objectives determination, policy making, and even budgeting. Yet students for the most part are not trained observers or workers in any of these areas. If we wish and expect students to be meaningfully involved, they must acquire at least a layman's level of knowledge and skills related to educational decision-making. One attempt, which seems to remain unreplicated, was a trial instructional development project at Syracuse University in the early 1970's (Richardson, et al., 1973). A group of Honors students, in conjunction with graduate interns in I.D., undertook a course revision project in History 255 (American History Through the Civil War). The Honors history students served as the content specialists, two graduate interns served as the instructional developers, and the role of evaluator was taken by an intern in evaluation. Faculty members and staff from the Center of Instructional Development served as advisors, but the primary responsibility for the success of the project fell on the group of undergraduate and

graduate students. The conclusions of this pilot project were:

- "Student input is valuable and often essential."
- "It will take longer to develop a course using students as active participants."
- "If students are used, they must be carefully guided so that they know what is expected of them at each stage."
- "The students must be helped to become effective as an informal group so they can discuss, disagree, express their feelings, compromise, and decide without being overly defensive."
- "This project was an effective learning experience for the students."
- "Time and tasks have to be carefully organized for maximum efficiency."
- "The experience of administering such a project is excellent training for an intern in instructional development."

The necessity of beginning student development efforts is also reflected in public demands for accountability, fiscal restraint, and consumer protection, all of which have been heightened by the increasing costs of inflation and decreasing scores on nationally standardized tests. The issue goes beyond "Why can't Johnny read?" to "Why won't Johnny read?" It goes beyond keeping the student active in the classroom, to preparing the person to be an active participant in the world for a lifetime. It goes beyond preparing the student to pass the next test, to preparing the student to pass life.

Most Americans spend from 10 to 18 years of their lives in formal learning environments. During this time our major efforts as instructional developers are intended to benefit those who attend school. We work hard to prepare the organization, the faculty, and the learning setting so that students will derive the optimal benefits from schooling. From the student's view, more often than not, school is a way station between childhood and the working world. And more often than not schools refrain from teaching the student how to cope, how to survive, or how to advance once the formal schooling has ended.

A common phrase heard by this author is that "students come and students go, but the faculty stay forever." This is a view of the world from an instructional perspective. In the time-space continuum of life, people called students meet people called teachers in a place called school. Most people are called students for only a brief time in their life; yet in today's world one must be a learner from birth until retirement, at least. The hope is that retirees will also remain active learners.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS AND COMPLEMENTARY ASPECTS OF STUDENT DEVELOPMENT TO I.D., F.D., AND O.D.

Student development complements the efforts of instructional, faculty, and organizational development. By preparing students to organize their lives, evaluate their successes and failures, seek and critique new information on their own, and generally separate the flowers from the fertilizer, students become independent, self-reliant individuals. By educating students to become sophisticated consumers of education we can prepare them for an active, constructive role within the educational process. Where students are involved in the development processes, either as participants or recipients, student development efforts can impact heavily and appropriately.

As an example of the interlocking relationship of student development and faculty development let us look at the course and faculty assessment programs carried out at many schools. There has been a recent tendency for institutions to conduct formal assessments and for individual interested faculty members to conduct informal surveys regarding the worth of a course and/or the expertise of the teacher. Perhaps the most powerful confounding variable in this process is the student. While most learners know what they like and don't like about a course or teacher, very few can answer each of these questions:

1. What is it that I am supposed to be learning?
2. What constitutes effective teaching?
3. Can what I am learning be applied beyond this classroom?
4. How am I to be evaluated? (How are "grades" determined?)
5. By what methods do I learn most effectively and efficiently? Are those methods employed in this course or by this teacher?
6. Is the instruction pertinent to my educational and life goals?
7. What specific kinds of comments (on this survey) would be of the greatest benefit to the instructor or administration for the purpose of course or faculty improvement?

When students are taught how to evaluate their instruction and how to constructively respond to course and faculty evaluations, the validity of those surveys will probably increase. This gives the faculty, administration, and instructional developers a more solid data base from which decisions can be made regarding faculty development.

The relationship between student development and organizational development is, perhaps, the least obvious. At many schools students are included on committees involved with admissions criteria and procedures, budgetary considerations, capital improvements, assessment of courses, curriculum improvement, and selection of faculty and administrators. When placed on such committees

students are at a distinct disadvantage, faced with experienced and knowledgeable faculty and administrators whose tenure at the school may be five to 20 times that of the students. The students have an immediate perspective of the institution; faculty and administration have a more longitudinal perspective. The most importatnt distinction between students and faculty/administration, however, are 1) power and 2) knowledge of the system; the who, what, where, when, why, and how of the system's inner workings.

As a group, students will probably never acquire the level of power held by faculty and administrators except by court judgments, such as Olsoon v. Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, 412 N.Y.S. 2nd 615 (1979). In such cases instructional responsibility for fair practice and adherence to policy may be defined in favor of the students. Be that as it may, these "junior partners" in the organizational development process can be taught the basics of committee work, budgeting, curriculum evaluation and improvement, personnel selection, contract specification, and other intellectual skills necessary for meaningful involvement in decision making. These skills can then be used by the students in their personal and professional lives. Many schools advertising in the Chronicle of Higher Education hire personnel to advise and train officers in student government and Hellenic organizations. Such services also could be provided to students serving on institutional committees.

The most obvious relationships are those combining student development with instructional development. Here the focus of both is on the learners. Instructional development has faced budgetary constraints in the past, and there is little hope that the near future will bring relief. This means that we will continue to attempt to formulate instruction which reaches the most students with the least expenditure of available resources. It is still less expensive to teach learners to cope with the instruction than to provide multiple formats. Augmenting the educational cognitive style of a student through structured practice and experiences will increase the person's skills for learning from a variety of instructional formats (Bass and Hand, 1978).

Students are often called upon by I.D. teams to assist in such tasks as problem definition (this author prefers the phrase "definition of potential," aimed at the positive rather than negative), goal specification, field testing of instructional packages, and evaluation of the teaching/learning process. Braden and Terrell (1978) suggest that students could be of much more use in the I.D. process, in approaching faculty with course revision ideas, in working with faculty who might feel threatened by instructional developers, and in active participation on small scale projects. Once again, to provide meaningful input for the I.D. team the students should be taught something about each of these tasks and how the tasks are evaluated.

HOW CAN STUDENT DEVELOPMENT BE CARRIED OUT?

Student development is, as the reader has seen, an educational and evaluative process. Therefore, student development can be carried out exactly as any other instructional program, i.e., through a multitutde of methods and strategies. For each component of S.D. there is content to be learned, processes to be mastered, and intellectual skills to be acquired. Student development must be lived, however; it cannot occur vicariously. The student must be actively involved in the task of budgeting, for instance, to fully comprehend how budgetary considerations interrelate and to grasp the very personal impacts of budgetary policy upon personnel and programs.

In brief, the student must learn something before it can be applied. And it must be applied before learning is complete. Student development, then, is accomplished through these two sets of learning experiences.

WHERE IS STUDENT DEVELOPMENT BEING IMPLEMENTED?

Student development as discussed in this paper has been instituted as an organized, integrated set of services in a relatively small number of schools. At the University of Vermont (Burlington) the program is called the Living and Learning Center (John Engroff, Jr., Director). The center is housed in a six-building complex built specifically as a living/learning facility. Students and faculty live, study, and socialize in academic clusters, and outside those clusters with the rest of the university. Students propose academic study programs to be housed in the L.L.C., formulate budget, set learning objectives, devise instructional experiences, and establish formative evaluation plans for their own programs. Faculty may also submit proposals. The Director and Assistant Director/Program Coordinator assist the students and faculty in developing and clarifying program ideas and learning objectives, interpreting proposal guidelines, identifying resources and program evaluators, and developing the program's budget. All these steps are outlined and discussed in a brochure (Living/Learning Center, 1979) available from the Center. Of 45 programs housed in the L.L.C. during 1979, 30 were proposed by the students. Six hundred people living academics, sharing perceptions and knowledge, guiding their own education, evaluating their lives and their instruction; this is the thrust of the Living and Learning Center at the University of Vermont.

The Student Development Center at the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville is a drop-in center rather than a live-in facility. The S.D.C. is composed of three units: Learning Resources, Special Services, and Counseling. special Services is funded by federal monies, and provides remedial and developmental assistance to disadvantaged students. This unit was established for students with

overall low scores and low grades, and for students who may be "educationally and economically deprived."

The Learning Resources Unit allows students to improve basic academic skills required to achieve their educational goals. Clients of the unit include those on academic probation, students with English as a second language, professional school students with academic support needs, or students needing individual attention in the areas of reading, mathematics, or study skills. Faculty tutors work with students in both Learning Resources and Special Services. In addition, one-to-one and small group educational consultation and mini-workshops on selected topics are provided by both these units.

The Counseling Unit seeks to improve the student's skills required for personal, social, and cultural growth and development. This unit was organized specifically to serve students who desire personal development experiences or counseling as well as life-planning counseling. Graduate assistants in counselor education and psychology are employed and they are available to students without appointments and at no cost.

Funding of the Student Development Center at the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville has come from three sources. Seed money in the amount of $10,000 came from the University of Arkansas Foundation, with an equal amount reserved for each campus of the U. of A. system. Expenditure of this money was restricted to the purchase of hardware and software intended for use in learning skills centers. Additional funds were secured from a federal "Title" grant and from room rents which cover custodial services, physical plant maintenance, hall advisors, and domitory assistants.

LONG-TERM STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

The University of Arkansas Medical Sciences Campus (UAMSC) has planned a long range student development project which will eventually link the health sciences professional programs with students, educators, and counselors at all levels from junior high school students to those already enrolled in the health science professional programs. This effort is being piggybacked on existing programs as much as possible to reduce costs. For instance, UAMSC currently has a federal grant supporting efforts to increase the number of minority health science professionals. As part of that effort the Office of Minority Student Affairs (OMSA) visits most of the four-year and two-year colleges and universities in Arkansas, speaking with students, faculty, and counselors about opportunities for minorities in medicine, pharmacy, nursing, and related health professions. OMSA also sponsors a summer enrichment program for entering minority medical and pharmacy students, and provides continuing counseling assistance for all minority students enrolled in medicine, pharmacy, nursing, and related health professions. The proposed student development effort will complement and expand these services to all students who wish to enroll in any program at UAMSC.

Phase one of this enterprise entailed the establishment of a Pre-Medical Academic Consortium (PMAC) linking UAMSC with each of Arkansas' four-year institutions from which the College of Medicine draws its applicant pool. Phases two and three will include the addition of high schools and junior high schools within the Consortium.

The purposes of the PMAC, established in August 1980, include the following:

1. Screen interested students for specific content and learning skills and weaknesses.
2. Work with learning skills specialists, counselors, and faculty on Consortium campuses to provide programs for increasing each student's skills and knowledge.
3. Work with faculty on each campus to provide specific content assistance for students if tutorial programs do not currently exist.
4. Offer a communication link between UAMSC College of Medicine, Consortium faculty members and pre-med committee members, providing a formal link between pre-med academic programs and UAMSC.
5. sponsor summer courses offered at the end of the undergraduate freshman and sophomore years to upgrade content knowledge, provide exposure of UAMSC to undergraduates, provide learning skills assistance if desired, and to provide career and life counseling to interested students.
6. Establish a network of learning specialists who will work with students from junior high school, through high school and undergraduate school, into medical school (if necessary) to continuously increase the student's potential for success in medical school and as a physician.
7. Develop and distribute a PMAC Newsletter publicizing educational advances, curriculum changes, innovative approaches to teaching, funds and grants secured, and other items of interest.

Efforts during the initial year of the Pre-Medical Academic Consortium focused on four inexpensive activities: the newsletter, campus visitations, diagnostic screening, and a set of guidelines as to the types of information and the format for letters of recommendation from pre-med committees to be included in the applicant's admission file.

Efforts during the second year focused upon adding four activities. An annual meeting of selected faculty form each undergraduate school and UAMSC College of Medicine was held to

discuss methods for "bridging the gap" between pre-medical and medical studies. Summer work experiences for pre-medical students were offered in laboratories, hospitals, clinics, and physician's offices. A "mock MCAT" (Medical College Admissions Test) was offered, to identify junior students' content weaknesses so that they could focus their review studies for the actual admissions examination. And finally, learning skills specialists from PMAC campuses (members of the Arkansas Consortium on developmental Education) were involved in diagnosing and strengthening of students' reading skills, visual perception/discrimination skills, deductive reasoning, and oral communication skills.

During the 1980-81 year of PMAC a Student Development Center was established on the UAMS campus within the Office of Educational Development. Services provided were related specifically to the aims of students development as stated in this paper. Under the auspices of the Office of Educational Development (a campus-wide service organization offering I.D., F.D., and O.D. in addition to student development) staff worked with students, faculty, administrators, and other educational service units in an attempt to impact each and every component of the educational process at UAMSC. Through the establishment of pre-professional academic consortia the impact on students wishing a career in the health sciences should be extended, eventually, from junior high or high school throughout their professional training.

As indicated previously the Student Development Center will piggyback on existing funds, personnel, space, material, and furniture. Additional sources of funding will be sought from state allocations, private foundation grants and possible federal funds. As examples of piggybacking the following are currently available on the UAMS campus, and can be tapped by the Student Development Center:

1. Eight private study/conference rooms and over 100 learning carrels in the library;
2. Wet carrels with slidetape, videotape, filmstrip, 8mm motion picture and computer terminal capabilities (all with software files) in the AV Library, located in the main Library;
3. Faculty tutor programs;
4. Graduate assistant and upperclassmen tutor programs;
5. Committees of faculty and students, the purposes of which are to recruit and retain students within UAMSC programs;
6. A grant to recruit and retain minority health professions students in Medicine and pharmacy;
7. Liaison committees working between UAMSC and several four year "feeder colleges," including UAMSC faculty, Admissions Director, Director of Minority Student Affairs, and other administrators;
8. In-state automobile travel funds from state and federal monies;
9. Study guide materials developed by various departments and the Office of Educational Development;
10. Counselors within the Psychiatry Department.

In addition to on-campus resources, UAMSC has an agreement with the Learning Development Center at the University of Arkansas-Little Rock, within two miles of UAMSC. UA-Little Rock has extensive diagnostic materials and sophisticated equipment, and a staff of learning specialists available to UAMSC students all for a fee of $50 per year. This charge is currently paid from a special UAMSC fund for medical students who need the sophisticated assistance available at UA-Little Rock. Students in the College of Health-Related Professions are expected to pay the fee from personal funds.

SUMMARY

Student development programs are on the rise in this country. Most of the programs focus upon improvement of academic skills, course selections, career choice, and personal counseling. The existing programs work with students from the time of admission through graduation to increase their potential for success on that campus alone. The author could not identify any current program which extended services to students several years prior to admissions or after graduation. Neither has this author found a student development program, integrated with instructional development, faculty development, or organizational development, which attempts to meet the broad definition of services listed earlier in this paper.

It is time for student development (S.D.) to take its complementary place alongside I.D., F.D., and O.D. For if we attempt to change instruction, faculty members, and the educational organization without paying heed to the students we will have ignored an integral part of the educational process. Beyond that we must come to view the student as a person who comes to school as preparation for life as well as for academic/intellectual fulfillment. Part of our job as educators must be to prepare the students to face life as active participants; independent, dedicated to continuing their education throughout life, and educated to be sophisticated consumers of education.

REFERENCES

Bass, R.K. and Hand, J.D. Cognitive style mapping--Its Place in instructional development, in Bass, R.K., Dills, C.R., and Lumsden, D.B. (Eds.), Instructional Development; The State of the Art. Collegiate Publishing, Inc., San Diego, Calif., 1978.

Braden, R.A. and Terrell, W.R. The challenge from within: some unpopular views on instruc-

tional Development, in Bass, R.K., Dills, C.R. and Lumsden, D.B. (Eds.), Instructional Development: The State of the Art. Collegiate Publishing, Inc., San Diego, Calif., 1978.

Cronbach, L.J. Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 116-127.

Living/Learning Center. Student Designed Programs. Burlington, Vermont: University of Vermont, 1979.

Office of Student Development, Residence and Dining Halls, The Ohio State University. Assistant director, office of student development. Chronicle of Higher Education, 1980, 20, (22), 23.

Richardson, P. and Schatz, A. with Owen, T.R. Student Involvement in Course Revision. Center for Instructional Development, Syracuse University: Syracuse, N.Y., Report 1, August, 1973.

Student Affairs Lincoln University (PA). Director of counseling. Chronicle of Higher Education, 1980, 20, (20), 33.